

**REMARKS**

**I. Status of the Application**

Claims 1-35 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 20-22 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 4-19 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 20 have been amended. No new matter is added.

**II. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over European Patent Publication EP 49521 A2 to Nakanishi et al. (“Nakanishi”)**

Claims 1-3 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nakanishi. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**A. Claims 1 and 20**

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

an inter-process communication unit which controls inter-process communication between processes executed on the plurality of processors, which inter-process communication unit is functionally provided independently of said OS

As recited above, the claimed inter-process communication unit is functionally provided independently of the OS. On the other hand, Nakanishi teaches that communication between processes occurs within the OS. For example, Nakanishi teaches that “[w]hen an SVC (super visor call) instruction is issued during a process, a macro instruction processing of the operating system within the job processor 300m is started.” See Nakanishi at page 7, lines 13-16. In addition, Nakanishi also teaches that “if allocation of resource is necessary, the operating system

within the current processor executes a contact processing for sending a request of exclusive use of resource to the operating system processor 3001.” See Nakanishi at page 10, lines 4-7. In other words, Nakanishi is directed to a multiprocessor OS, wherein the processor communication mechanism located inside the OS processes a system call. Therefore, Nakanishi fails to teach that inter-process communication unit is functionally provided independently of the OS.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Nakanishi for at least the foregoing reason. Further, since claim 20 recites features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 20 is patentable over Nakanishi for at least reasons similar to those set forth for claim 1.

**B. Claims 2-3 and 21-22**

Since claims 2-3 and 21-22 are dependent upon claims 1 and 20, respectively, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable over Nakanishi at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

**III. Conclusion**


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/807,168

Attorney Docket No.: Q80602

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
for Howard L. Bernstein Reg. # 39,283  
Registration No. 25,665

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2008